Appl. No. 10/840,183
Amdt. dated October 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 16 has been cancelled. Claims 17-22 have been added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-15 and 17-22 will be pending in this application. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 12-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Azevedo et al. (US Patent Number 7,035,979). Claims 2-11 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Allowance of the pending claims and reconsideration of these rejections and objections in light of these amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indicated allowability of claims 2-11.

Amendments to the Title

The title was objected to as not being descriptive of the invention. Applicant has amended the title as suggested by the Examiner; the amended title is also reflected in an updated Application Data Sheet submitted herewith. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the title.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102, Azevedo et al.

Claims 1 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Azevedo et al. (US Patent Number 7,035,979).

Claim 1

Claim 1 is allowable as Azevedo does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites:

> *testing whether a present read access request is such that there is a high probability that said present <u>read access request relates to configuration data</u> for said programmable logic device.*

Azevedo monitors data requests and recognizes patterns in the data requests. *See Azevedo*, column 12 lines 4-5. For example, one pattern is when the same data is repetitively being accessed. *Id.*, column 11 lines 41-55. The recognition of patterns requires looking at multiple access requests in order to recognize a pattern in the access requests. Thus, Azevedo looks at how access requests relate to other access requests, and not to whether an access request relates to a particular type of data. In contrast, claim 1 recites testing that the "*present read access request relates to configuration data for said programmable logic device.*" More particularly, Azevedo does not even mention "configuration data" for a programmable logic device (PLD).

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-11 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 12-15 and 17-22

Applicants submit that independent claims 12 and 13 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim1. Claims 17-19 depend from claim 12, and claims 20-22 depend from claim 13 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Objection to Claims 2-11

Claims 2-11 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the foregoing arguments with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submits that claims 2-11 are in condition for allowance without being rewritten in independent form. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/840,183
Amdt. dated October 16, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
BSS:CKmk:db
60815736 v1